

Amendments To The Drawings:

The attached drawing sheet includes original FIGS. 6 and 7, which are described in the specification and the priority document but which appear to have been omitted from the published application.

Attachment: ONE new sheet of original FIGS. 6 and 7.

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In the office action mailed July 17, 2007, the Abstract was objected to as being more than 150 words. It was also objected to as being unclear and not concise. The title was also objected to and characterized as not being descriptive.

Claims 2-5 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, ¶2 as being indefinite because claim 2 recites the term, "an imaginary circle..." which was considered to be ambiguous. Claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. patent no. 5,888,055 to Lee. Claims 2 and 5 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Lee* in view of U.S. patent 5,081,847 to Anderson.

In paragraph 10 of the office action, the claims were said to conflict with application serial number 10/427,781. On August 2, 2007, the undersigned attorney for the applicant called the Examiner by telephone and inquired as to the nature of the conflict and was told that the allegedly conflicting claims were identical to the claims pending in this application. On August 6, 2007, the Examiner telephoned the undersigned representative of the applicant and stated that in fact, U.S. application serial number 10/427,781 had been abandoned and that the double-patenting rejection was in error. An Interview Summary was subsequently mailed from the USPTO (on August 17th), which stated that the double-patenting rejection has been withdrawn. The applicant thus considers the double-patenting rejection as moot.

Referring now the Examiner's objections to the application, a new Abstract is submitted with this response that is shorter, more descriptive and concise. A new title is also being submitted that is considered to be descriptive. The objections to the specification are thus believed overcome.

Regarding *another* matter that was *not* raised by the Examiner, it appears that FIGS. 6 and 7 are missing from the USPTO-published application. A comparison of the published application text to the figures that were published by the USPTO shows that FIG. 6 and FIG. 7 do not appear therein, however, the "Brief Description of the Drawings," identifies and briefly describes both FIG. 6 and FIG. 7. Moreover, the "Detailed Description" also refers to and describes FIG. 6 and FIG. 7.

The applicant presumes that FIGS. 6 and 7 were either inadvertently not included

with the original application papers, which were filed by a different law firm, or the figures were inadvertently misplaced by the Patent Office after the application was filed.

In any case, since it is clear from the specification and from the applicant's priority document that FIGS. 6 and 7 are disclosed and described, two new drawing sheets are being submitted with this response. The new figures are English-language copies of FIG. 6 and FIG. 7 that were filed with the applicant's priority document, i.e., Korean patent application 2002-74815. No new matter has been added by the fact that this application claims priority to the Korean application.

Regarding the claim rejections, claims 2 and 3 have been incorporated into claim 1, rendering amended claim 1 allowable over the references that were cited by the Examiner. Claims 2 and 3 have been cancelled.

The claims have also been amended to delete language and terminology that relies on the use of "an imaginary circle." The claims now describe the arrangement of the various structural elements with respect to a geometric circle, which is a term believed to be more descriptive and less ambiguous than "imaginary."

Since the rejections have been traversed, reconsideration of the pending claims is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,


Joseph P. Krause, Reg. No. 32,578
Ladas & Parry
224 South Michigan Avenue
Chicago, Illinois 60604
(312) 427-1300

Dated: October 8, 2007

APPENDIX OF ATTACHMENTS

Application Serial No. 10/672,986
Reply to Office Action of July 17, 2007

**ONE New Sheet of FIGS. 6 and 7
(a total of 1 sheet of drawings)**